arXiv:1610.05186v1 [math.PR] 17 Oct 2016

EMPIRICAL SPECTRAL DISTRIBUTIONS OF SPARSE RANDOM GRAPHS

AMIR DEMBO AND EYAL LUBETZKY

Abstract. We study the spectrum of a random multigraph with a degree sequence $\mathbf{D}_n = (D_i)_{i=1}^n$ and average degree $1 \ll \omega_n \ll n$, generated by the configuration model. We show that, when the empirical spectral distribution (ESD) of $\omega_n^{-1}\mathbf{D}_n$ converges weakly to a limit ν, under mild moment assumptions (*e.g.*, D_i/ω_n are i.i.d. with a finite second moment), the ESD of the normalized adjacency matrix converges in probability to $\nu \boxtimes \sigma_{\rm SC}$, the free multiplicative convolution of ν with the semicircle law. Relating this limit with a variant of the Marchenko–Pastur law yields the continuity of its density (away from zero), and an effective procedure for determining its support.

Our proof of convergence is based on a coupling of the graph to an inhomogeneous Erdős-Rényi graph with the target ESD, using three intermediate random graphs, with a negligible number of edges modified in each step.

1. Introduction

We study the spectrum of a random multigraph $G_n = (V_n, E_n)$ with degrees $\{D_i^{(n)}\}_{i=1}^n$, constructed by the configuration model (associating vertex $i \in V_n$ with $D_i^{(n)}$ half-edges and drawing a uniform matching of all half-edges), where $|E_n| = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n D_i^{(n)}$ has

$$|E_n|/n \to \infty\,, \qquad |E_n| = o(n^2)\,. \tag{1.1}$$

Letting A_{G_n} denote the adjacency matrix of G_n, it is well-known (see, *e.g.*, [1]) that, for random regular graphs—the case of $D_i^{(n)} = d_n$ for all i with $1 \ll d_n \ll n$—the empirical spectral distribution (ESD, defined for a symmetric matrix A with eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_n$ as $\mathcal{L}^A = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{\lambda_i}$) of the normalized matrix $\hat{A}_{G_n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_n}} A_{G_n}$ converges weakly, in probability, to $\sigma_{\rm SC}$, the standard semicircle law (with support $[-2, 2]$).

The non-regular case with $|E_n| = O(n)$ has been studied by Bordenave and Lelarge [4] when the graphs G_n converge in the Benjamini–Schramm sense, translating in the above setup to having $\{D_i^{(n)}\}$ that are i.i.d. in i and uniformly integrable in n. The existence and uniqueness of the limiting ESD was obtained in [4] by relating the Stieltjes transform of the ESD to a recursive distributional equation (arising from the resolvent of the Galton–Watson trees corresponding to the local neighborhoods in G_n). Note that (a) this approach relies on the locally-tree-like structure of the graphs, and is thus tailored for low (at most logarithmic) degrees; and (b) very little is known on this limit, even in seemingly simple settings such as when all degrees are either 3 or 4.

At the other extreme, when $|E_n|$ diverges polynomially with n (whence the tree approximations are invalid), the trace method—the standard tool for establishing the convergence of the ESD of an Erdős–Rényi random graph to $\sigma_{\rm SC}$—faces the obstacle of nonnegligible dependencies between the edges in the configuration model.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C80, 60B20.

Key words and phrases. random matrices, empirical spectral distribution, random graphs.

In this work, we study the spectrum of G_n via sequence of approximation steps, each of which couples the multigraph with one that forgoes some of the dependencies, until finally arriving at a tractable Erdős–Rényi (inhomogeneous) random graph.

Our assumptions on the triangular sequence $\{D_i^{(n)}\}$ are that they correspond to a sparse multigraph, that is (1.1) holds, and, in addition, there exists some ω_n such that

$$\omega_n = (2 + o(1))|E_n|/n\,, \tag{1.2}$$

w.r.t. which the normalized degrees $\hat{D}_i^{(n)} = D_i^{(n)}/\omega_n$ satisfy that

$$\{\hat{D}_{U_n}^{(n)}\} \quad \text{is uniformly integrable with} \quad \mathbb{E}[(\hat{D}_{U_n}^{(n)})^2] = o(\sqrt{n/\omega_n})\,, \tag{1.3}$$

where U_n is uniformly chosen in $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. Let

$$\hat{A}_{G_n} := \omega_n^{-1/2} A_{G_n} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \hat{\Lambda}_n = \mathrm{diag}(\hat{D}_1^{(n)}, \ldots, \hat{D}_n^{(n)})\,.$$

Theorem 1.1. *Let $G_n = (V_n, E_n)$ be the random multigraph with degrees $\{D_i^{(n)}\}_{i=1}^n$ such that (1.1)–(1.3) hold, and suppose that the* ESD *$\mathcal{L}^{\hat{\Lambda}_n}$ converges weakly to a limit $\nu_{\hat{D}}$. Then the* ESD *$\mathcal{L}^{\hat{A}_{G_n}}$ converges weakly, in probability, to $\nu_{\hat{D}} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}}$, the free multiplicative convolution of $\nu_{\hat{D}}$ with the standard semicircle law σ_{SC}.*

Remark 1.2. The free multiplicative convolution was defined for probability measures of non-zero mean, in terms of their S-transform, first ([10]) for measures with bounded support, and then ([3]) for measures supported on $\mathbb{R}_+$. Following the extension in [7] of the S-transform to measures of zero mean and finite moments of all order, [2, Theorem 6] provides the S-transform for symmetric measures $\sigma \neq \delta_0$ and [2, Theorem 7] correspondingly defines the free multiplicative convolution of such σ with $\nu \neq \delta_0$ supported on $\mathbb{R}_+$, a special case of which appears in Theorem 1.1.

Remark 1.3. The standard GOE random matrix X_n (or any Wigner matrix whose i.i.d. entries have finite moments of all order), is asymptotically free of any uniformly bounded diagonal $\hat{\Lambda}_n^{1/2}$ (see, *e.g.*, [1, Theorem 5.4.5]). With the spectral radius of the GOE X_n bounded by $2 + \delta$ up to an exponentially small probability, a truncation argument extends the validity of [1, Corollary 5.4.11] to show that $\nu_{\hat{D}} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}}$ is then also the weak limit of the ESD for the random matrices $B_n = \hat{\Lambda}_n^{1/2} X_n \hat{\Lambda}_n^{1/2}$.

Corollary 1.4. *Let $\{\hat{D}_i^{(n)} : 1 \le i \le n\}$ be i.i.d. for each n, such that $\mathbb{E}\hat{D}_1^{(n)} = 1$, $\sup_n \mathbb{E}[(\hat{D}_1^{(n)})^2] < \infty$, and the law of $\hat{D}_1^{(n)}$ converges weakly to some $\nu_{\hat{D}}$. For every sequence ω_n such that $\omega_n \to \infty$ and $\omega_n = o(n)$, if G_n is the random multigraph with degrees $D_i^{(n)} = [\omega_n \hat{D}_i^{(n)}]$ (modifying $D_n^{(n)}$ by 1 if needed for an even sum of the degrees), then the* ESD *$\mathcal{L}^{\hat{A}_{G_n}}$ converges weakly, in probability, to $\nu_{\hat{D}} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}}$.*

Our convergence results, Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.4, are proved in §2. We note that, using the same approach, analogs of these results can be derived for the case of uniformly chosen *simple* graphs under an extra assumption on the maximal degree, *e.g.*, $\max_i D_i = o(\sqrt{n})$, whereby the effect of loops and multiple edges is negligible.



FIGURE 1. Spectra of two random multigraphs on $n = 1000$ vertices with different degree sequences $\{D_i\}$. In red, $D_i = [\tau_i\sqrt{n}]$ for all i, and in blue, $D_i = [\tau_i \log n]$ for $i < n - \sqrt{n}$ and $D_i = [\tau_i\sqrt{n}]$ for $i \geq n - \sqrt{n}$, with $\tau_i \sim 1 + \mathrm{Exp}(1)$ i.i.d. (bottom plot). The limiting law for the ESD, shown by Therorem 1.1 to be $\nu_{\hat{D}} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}}$, is plotted in black (top plot).

The next two propositions, proved in §3, relate the limiting measure $\nu_{\hat{D}} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}}$ with a Marchenko–Pastur law, and thereby, via [9], yield its support and density regularity.

Proposition 1.5. *Let $\nu_{\hat{D}}$ be the law of a nonnegative random variable $\hat{D}$ with $\mathbb{E}\hat{D} = 1$. The free multiplicative convolution $\mu = \nu_{\hat{D}} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}}$ has the Cauchy–Stieltjes transform*

$$G_\mu(z) := \int \frac{1}{t-z} d\mu(t) = -z^{-1}\left[1 + G_{\widetilde{\mu}}(z)^2\right], \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{C}_+, \tag{1.4}$$

where the symmetric probability measure $\widetilde{\mu}$ is the push forward under $x \mapsto \pm\sqrt{x}$ of the Marchenko–Pastur limit μ_{MP} (on $\mathbb{R}_+$) of the ESD *of $n^{-1}\Lambda_n \widetilde{X}_n \widetilde{X}_n^* \Lambda_n$, in which the non-symmetric $\widetilde{X}_n$ has standard i.i.d. complex Gaussian entries and $\mathcal{L}^{\Lambda_n} \Rightarrow \nu$ for non-negative diagonal matrices Λ_n and the size-biased ν such that $\frac{d\nu}{d\nu_{\hat{D}}}(x) = x$ on $\mathbb{R}_+$.*

Remark 1.6. With $\nu^{(2)}$ denoting the push-forward of ν by the map $x \mapsto x^2$ (that is, the weak limit of $\mathcal{L}^{\Lambda_n^2}$), we have similarly to Remark 1.3 that $\mu_{\mathrm{MP}} = \nu^{(2)} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}}^{(2)}$, where the push-forward $\sigma_{\mathrm{SC}}^{(2)}$ (of density $(2\pi)^{-1}\sqrt{4/x - 1}$ on $[0, 4]$), is the limiting empirical distribution of singular values of $n^{-1/2}\widetilde{X}_n$.



FIGURE 2. Recovering the support of the limiting ESD. Left: ESD of the random multigraph on $n = 1000$ vertices with degrees $\sqrt{n}$, $3\sqrt{n}$, $15\sqrt{n}$ in frequencies 0.5, 0.49, 0.01, resp. Right: $\xi(v)$ from Remark 1.8.

Recall [9, Lemma 3.1, Lemma 3.2] that $h(z) := G_{\mu_{\rm MP}}(z)$ is uniformly bounded on $\mathbb{C}_+$ away from the imaginary axis, and [9, Theorem 1.1] that $h(z) \to h(x)$ whenever $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$ converges to $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Further, the $\mathbb{C}_+$-valued function $h(x)$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ with the corresponding continuous density

$$\rho_{\rm MP}(x) := \frac{d\mu_{\rm MP}}{dx} = \frac{1}{\pi}\Im(h(x))\,, \tag{1.5}$$

being real analytic at any $x \neq 0$ where it is positive. The density $\widetilde{\rho}(x) = |x|\rho_{\rm MP}(x^2)$ of $\widetilde{\mu}$ inherits these regularity properties. Bounding $\widetilde{\rho}$ uniformly and analyzing the effect of (1.4) we next make similar conclusions about the density $\rho(x)$ of μ, now also at $x = 0$.

Proposition 1.7. *In the setting of Proposition 1.5, for $x \neq 0$ there is density*

$$\rho(x) := \frac{d\mu}{dx} = -2\Re(h(x^2))\widetilde{\rho}(x)\,, \tag{1.6}$$

which is continuous, symmetric, and moreover real analytic where positive. The support of μ is $S_\mu := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \rho(x) > 0\} = S_{\widetilde{\mu}}$, which up to the mapping $x \mapsto x^2$ further matches the support $S_{\mu_{\rm MP}}$ of $\mu_{\rm MP}$. In addition $\pi\widetilde{\rho}(x) \le 1 \wedge (2/|x|)$, $\pi\rho(x) \le (\mathbb{E}\hat{D}^{-2})^{1/2} \wedge (4/|x|^3)$ and if $\nu_{\hat{D}}(\{0\}) = 0$ then μ is absolutely continuous (i.e., $\mu(\{0\}) = 0$).

Remark 1.8. Recall the unique inverse of h on $h(\mathbb{C}_+)$ given by

$$\xi(h) := -\frac{1}{h} + \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\hat{D}^2}{1 + h\hat{D}}\right], \tag{1.7}$$

namely $\xi(h(z)) = z$ throughout $\mathbb{C}_+$ (see [9, Eqn. (1.4)]). This inverse extends analytically to a neighborhood of $\mathbb{C}_+ \cup \Gamma$ for $\Gamma := \{h \in \mathbb{R} : h \neq 0, -h^{-1} \in S^c_{\hat{\nu}_D}\}$ and [9, Theorems 4.1 & 4.2] show that $x \in S^c_{\mu_{\rm MP}}$ iff $\xi'(v) > 0$ for $v \in \Gamma$, where $v = h(x)$ and $x = \xi(v)$ (thus validating the characterization of $S_{\mu_{\rm MP}}$ which has been proposed in [6]). We show in Lemma 3.1 that $\Re(h(x^2)) < 0$ everywhere, hence the behavior of $\rho(x)$ at the soft-edges of S_μ can be read from the soft-edges of $S_{\mu_{\rm MP}}$ (as in [5, Prop. 2.3]).



FIGURE 3. Phase diagram for the existence of holes in the limiting ESD when $\nu_{\hat{D}}$ is supported on two atoms $\alpha > \beta > 0$ as given by Corollary 1.9. Left: the region (1.8) (where S_μ is not connected) highlighted in blue. Right: zooming in on the emergence of a hole as α varies at $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$.

Corollary 1.9. *Suppose $\nu_{\hat{D}}$ of mean one is supported on two atoms $\alpha > \beta > 0$. The support S_μ of $\mu = \nu_{\hat{D}} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}}$ is then disconnected iff*

$$\alpha > \beta\Big[\frac{3}{1-(1-\beta)^{1/3}} - 1\Big]. \tag{1.8}$$

Moreover, when (1.8) holds, $S_\mu \cap \mathbb{R}_+$ consists of exactly two disjoint intervals.

2. Convergence of the ESD's

The proof of Theorem 1.1 will use the following standard lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\{M_{n,r}\}_{n,r\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a family of matrices of order n, define $\mu_{n,r} = \mathcal{L}^{M_{n,r}}$ and $\eta(r) := \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}\big((M_{n,r} - M_{n,\infty})^2\big)$. Let $\{\mu_r : r \in \mathbb{N}\}$ denote a family of measures such that*

$$\mu_{n,r} \Rightarrow \mu_r \text{ as } n \to \infty \text{ for every } r \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{2.1}$$

$$\mu_{n,\infty} \text{ is tight}, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\eta(r) \to 0 \quad \text{as } r \to \infty. \tag{2.3}$$

Then the weak limit of $\mu_{n,\infty}$ as $n \to \infty$ exists and equals $\lim_{r\to\infty} \mu_r$.

Proof. Let μ_∞ be a limit point of $\mu_{n,\infty}$, the existence of which is guaranteed by the tightness assumption (2.2). A standard consequence of the Hoffman–Wielandt bound

(cf. [1, Lemma 2.1.19]) and Cauchy–Schwarz is that for matrices A and B of order n,

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathcal{L}^A, \mathcal{L}^B\right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}\left((A-B)^2\right) ,$$

where d_{BL} is the bounded-Lipchitz metric on the space $M_1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ of probability measures on $\mathbb{R}_+$ (see the proof of [1, Theorem 2.1.21]). Thus, by (2.1) and the triangle-inequality for d_{BL}, it follows that

$$\eta(r) \geq d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mu_\infty, \mu_r)^2 .$$

Consequently, $\mu_r \to \mu_\infty$ as $r \to \infty$, from which the uniqueness of μ_∞ also follows. ■

Proof of Theorem 1.1. In **Step I** we reduce the proof to dealing with the *single-adjacency* matrix A_n of G_n, where multiple copies of an edge/loop are replaced by a single one (that is, $A_n = A_{G_n} \wedge 1$ entry-wise), and further the collection $\{\omega_n^{-1} D_i^{(n)}\}$ is a fixed finite set $\mathcal{S}$. Scaling $\hat{A}_n := \omega_n^{-1/2} A_n$ we rely in **Step II**, on Proposition 2.3 to replace the limit points of $\mathcal{L}^{\hat{A}_n}$ by those of $\mathcal{L}^{\omega_n^{-1/2}\widetilde{A}_n}$ for symmetric matrices $\widetilde{A}_n$ of independent Bernoulli entries, using the moment method in **Step III** to relate the latter to the limit of $\mathcal{L}^{B_n}$ for the matrices B_n of Remark 1.3.

Step I. We claim that if $\mathcal{L}^{\hat{A}_n} \Rightarrow \mu$ in probability, then the same applies for $\mathcal{L}^{\hat{A}_{G_n}}$. This will follow from Lemma 2.1 with $M_{n,r} = \hat{A}_n$ and $M_{n,\infty} = \hat{A}_{G_n}$ upon verifying that

$$\xi_n := \mathbb{E}\left[\tfrac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}\left(\left(\hat{A}_{G_n} - \hat{A}_n\right)^2\right)\right] \to 0 . \tag{2.4}$$

Indeed, condition (2.1) has been assumed; condition (2.2) follows from the fact that

$$\frac{1}{2n} \operatorname{tr}\left(\hat{A}_{G_n}^2\right) \leq \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}\left(\left(\hat{A}_{G_n} - \hat{A}_n\right)^2\right) + \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}(\hat{A}_n^2) \leq \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}\left(\left(\hat{A}_{G_n} - \hat{A}_n\right)^2\right) + \frac{|E_n|}{n\omega_n} ,$$

so in particular $\mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}(\hat{A}_{G_n}^2)] \leq \xi_n + 1 + o(1)$, yielding tightness; and condition (2.3) holds in probability by (2.4) and Markov's inequality. To establish (2.4), observe that, for every i and j we have $(A_{G_n})_{i,j} \preceq \mathrm{Bin}(m, q)$ for $m = D_i^{(n)}$ and $q = D_j^{(n)}/|E_n|$, whereas $\mathrm{Bin}(m, q) \preceq Y_\lambda \sim \mathrm{Po}(\lambda)$ for every m and λ such that $1 - q \geq e^{-\lambda/m}$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(A_{G_n} - A_n)_{i,j}^2\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[(Y_\lambda - 1)_+^2\right] \leq \lambda^2 .$$

Since $q \leq \frac{1+o(1)}{\omega_n}$ uniformly over i, j, we take WLOG $\lambda = 2qm$, yielding for n large

$$\xi_n \leq \frac{2}{n\omega_n} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \Big[\frac{D_i^{(n)} D_j^{(n)}}{|E_n|}\Big]^2 \leq \frac{4\omega_n}{n} \Big[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{D}_i^{(n)})^2\Big] \to 0 ,$$

by our assumption that $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{D}_{U_n}^{(n)})^2] = o(\sqrt{n/\omega_n})$. Considering hereafter only single-adjacency matrices, we proceed to reduce the problem to the case where the variables $\hat{D}_i^{(n)}$ are all supported on a finite set. To this end, let $\ell = 2r^2$ for $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\hat{D}_i^{(n,r)} = \Psi_r(\hat{D}_i^{(n)}) \quad \text{for} \quad \Psi_r(x) := \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} d_j^{(r)} \mathbb{1}_{\left[d_j^{(r)}, d_{j+1}^{(r)}\right)}(x) ,$$

where $0 = d_1^{(r)} < \ldots < d_{\ell+1}^{(r)}$ are continuity points of $\nu_{\hat{D}}$ of interdistances in $[\frac{1}{2r}, \frac{1}{r}]$, which are furthermore in $\varepsilon_r\mathbb{Z}$ for some irrational $\varepsilon_r > 0$. Let

$$D_i^{(n,r)} = \omega_{n,r}\hat{D}_i^{(n,r)} \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \quad \text{for} \quad \omega_{n,r} := \frac{[\varepsilon_r\omega_n]}{\varepsilon_r}\,,$$

possibly deleting one half-edge from $D_n^{(n,r)}$ if needed to make $\sum_{i=1}^n D_i^{(n,r)}$ even.

Observation 2.2. *Let $\{d_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{d'_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be two degree sequence with $d_i \le d'_i$ for all i, and let G be a random multigraph with degrees $\{d_i\}$ generated by the configuration model. Construct H by (a) marking a uniformly chosen subset of d'_i half-edges of vertex i* BLUE*, independently; (b) retaining every edge that has two* BLUE *endpoints; and (c) adding an independent uniform matching on all other* BLUE *half-edges. Then H has the law of the random multigraph with degrees $\{d'_i\}$ generated by the configuration model.*

(Indeed, since the configuration model matches the half-edges in G via a uniformly chosen perfect matching, and the coloring step (a) is performed independently of this matching, it follows that the induced matching on the subset of BLUE half-edges that are matched to BLUE counterparts—namely, the edges retained in step (b)—is uniform.) Using this, and noting that $D_i^{(n,r)} \le D_i^{(n)}$ for all i, let $G_n^{(r)} = (V_n, E_n^{(r)})$ be the following random mutligraph with degrees $\{D_i^{(n,r)}\}$, coupled to the already-constructed G_n:

(a) For each i, mark a uniformly chosen subset of $D_i^{(n,r)}$ half-edges incident to vertex i as BLUE in G_n.
(b) Retain in $G_n^{(r)}$ every edge of E_n where both parts are BLUE.
(c) Complete the construction of $G_n^{(r)}$ via a uniformly chosen matching of all unmatched half-edges.

Let $\hat{A}_n^{(r)} = \omega_n^{-1/2}A_n^{(r)}$ for $A_n^{(r)}$, the single-adjacency matrix of $G_n^{(r)}$. We next control the difference between $\mathcal{L}^{\hat{A}_n}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\hat{A}_n^{(r)}}$. Indeed, by the definition of the coupling of G_n and $G_n^{(r)}$, the cardinality of the symmetric $E_n \triangle E_n^{(r)}$ is at most twice the number of *unmarked* half-edges in G_n. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2n}\operatorname{tr}\big((\hat{A}_n - \hat{A}_n^{(r)})^2\big) &\le \frac{1}{2n\omega_n}\left|E_n \triangle E_n^{(r)}\right| \le \frac{1}{n\omega_n}\sum_{i=1}^n (D_i^{(n)} - D_i^{(n,r)}) \\ &\le \frac{1+o(1)}{\varepsilon_r\omega_n} + \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{D}_i^{(n)} 1_{\{\hat{D}_i^{(n)} \ge r\}} =: \eta(n,r)\,, \qquad (2.5)\end{aligned}$$

where the first term in $\eta(n,r)$ accounts for the discrepancy between ω_n and $\omega_{n,r}$, the term $1/r$ accounts for the degree quantization, while the last term accounts for degree truncation (since $d_{\ell+1}^{(r)} \ge r$). Thanks to the assumed uniform integrability of $\{\hat{D}_{U_n}^{(n)}\}$ we have that $\eta(r) := \limsup_{n\to\infty}\eta(n,r)$ satisfies $\eta(r) \to 0$ as $r \to \infty$. Furthermore,

$$\int x^2 d\mathcal{L}^{\hat{A}_n} = \frac{1}{n}\operatorname{tr}(\hat{A}_n^2) \le 1 + o(1)$$

by the choice of ω_n in (1.2), yielding the tightness of $\mu_{n,\infty} := \mathcal{L}^{\hat{A}_n}$. Altogether, we conclude from Lemma 2.1 that, if $\mathcal{L}^{\hat{A}_n^{(r)}} \Rightarrow \mu_r$, then $\mathcal{L}^{\hat{A}_n} \Rightarrow \lim_{r\to\infty} \mu_r$.

Next, let $\omega_n^{(r)} = 2|E_n^{(r)}|/n$ (as in (1.2) but for the multigraph $G_n^{(r)}$). Since (see (2.5)),

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \left|1 - \frac{\omega_n^{(r)}}{\omega_n}\right| \le \eta(r) \to 0 \quad \text{as } r \to \infty\,,$$

WLOG we replace ω_n by $\omega_n^{(r)}$ in the definition of $\hat{A}_n^{(r)}$, *i.e.*, starting with

$$\hat{D}_i^{(n,r)} \in \{d_1^{(r)}, \ldots, d_\ell^{(r)}\} =: \mathcal{S}_r\,.$$

Further, note that the hypothesis $\mathcal{L}^{\hat{\Lambda}_n} \Rightarrow \nu_{\hat{D}}$ as $n \to \infty$, together with our choice of $\mathcal{S}_r$, implies that $\mathcal{L}^{\hat{\Lambda}_n^{(r)}}$ (corresponding to $\hat{\Lambda}_n = \mathrm{diag}(\hat{D}_1^{(n,r)}, \ldots, \hat{D}_n^{(n,r)})$) converges weakly for each r to some $\nu_{\hat{D}_r} \neq \delta_0$, supported on $\mathbb{R}_+$, and further, $\nu_{\hat{D}_r} \Rightarrow \nu_{\hat{D}} \neq \delta_0$, as $r \to \infty$.

Let $\mu^{(2)}$ denote hereafter the push-forward of the measure μ by the mapping $x \mapsto x^2$. Recall that $\nu_k \boxtimes \nu'_k \Rightarrow \nu \boxtimes \nu'$ provided $\nu_k \Rightarrow \nu \neq \delta_0$, $\nu'_k \Rightarrow \nu' \neq \delta_0$ all of which are supported on $\mathbb{R}_+$ (see, *e.g.*, [2, Prop. 3]). Applying this twice, we deduce that

$$\nu_{\hat{D}_r} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}}^{(2)} \boxtimes \nu_{\hat{D}_r} \Rightarrow \nu_{\hat{D}} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}}^{(2)} \boxtimes \nu_{\hat{D}}\,. \tag{2.6}$$

Recall [2, Lemma 8] that the LHS of (2.6) equals $(\nu_{\hat{D}_r} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}})^{(2)}$, while likewise its RHS equals $(\nu_{\hat{D}} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}})^{(2)}$. For any $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$, the function $g(x) = \frac{1}{2}[f(\sqrt{x}) + f(-\sqrt{x})]$ is in $C_b(\mathbb{R}_+)$. Thus, the weak convergence $(\nu_{\hat{D}_r} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}})^{(2)} \Rightarrow (\nu_{\hat{D}} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}})^{(2)}$, implies for the symmetric source measures, that $\nu_{\hat{D}_r} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}} \Rightarrow \nu_{\hat{D}} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}}$. In conclusion, it suffices hereafter to prove the theorem for the case where $\hat{D}_i^{(n)} \in \mathcal{S}$, a fixed finite set, for all n.

Step II. Turning to this task, for $1 \le a \le \ell$, let $m_a^{(n)} = |V_n^a|$ where $V_n^a = \{v \in V_n : \deg(v) = d_a\omega_n\}$ is the set of vertices of degree $d_a\omega_n$ in G_n. By assumption, $m_a^{(n)}/n \to \nu_a$ for $\nu_a := \nu_{\hat{D}}(\{d_a\})$. (Observe that our choice of ω_n dictates that $\sum_a d_a\nu_a = 1$.) For all $1 \le a, b \le \ell$, set

$$q_{a,b} := d_a d_b \nu_b\,.$$

Let $H_n = \cup_{a\le b} H_{a,b}^{(n)}$ for the edge-disjoint multigraphs $H_{a,b}^{(n)}$ that are generated by the configuration model in the following way.

- For $1 \le a \le \ell$, let $H_{(a,a)}^{(n)}$ be the random $D_{a,a}^{(n)}$-regular multigraph on V_n^a, where $D_{a,a}^{(n)} m_a^{(n)}$ is even and $\hat{D}_{a,a}^{(n)} := D_{a,a}^{(n)}/\omega_n$ converges to $q_{a,a}$ as $n \to \infty$.
- For $1 \le a < b \le \ell$, let $H_{a,b}^{(n)}$ be the random bipartite multigraph with sides (V_n^a, V_n^b) and degrees $D_{a,b}^{(n)}$ in V_n^a and $D_{b,a}^{(n)}$ in V_n^b, such that the detailed balance

$$D_{a,b}^{(n)} m_a^{(n)} = D_{b,a}^{(n)} m_b^{(n)}$$

holds, and $\hat{D}_{a,b}^{(n)} := D_{a,b}^{(n)}/\omega_n$ tends to $q_{a,b}$ as $n \to \infty$ (hence, $\hat{D}_{b,a}^{(n)} \to q_{b,a}$).

Finally, setting

$$\lambda_{a,b}^{(n)} = \frac{\omega_n}{n} d_a d_b \,, \tag{2.7}$$

let $\widetilde{A}_n$ denote the singe-adjacency matrix of the multigraph $\widetilde{H}_n = \cup_{a \le b} \widetilde{H}_{a,b}^{(n)}$, where the edge-disjoint multigraphs $H_{a,b}^{(n)}$ are defined as follows.

- For $1 \le a \le b \le \ell$, mutually independently set the multiplicity of the edge between distinct $i \in V_a^n$ and $j \in V_b^n$ in $\widetilde{H}_{a,b}^{(n)}$ to be a $\mathrm{Po}(\lambda_{a,b}^{(n)})$ random variable.
- For $1 \le a \le \ell$, mutually independently set the number of loops incident to $i \in V_n^a$ to be a $\mathrm{Po}(\frac{1}{2}\lambda_{a,a}^{(n)})$ random variable.

Our next proposition shows that $\mathcal{L}^{\hat{A}_n} \Rightarrow \nu_{\hat{D}} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}}$, in probability, whenever

$$\mathcal{L}^{\omega_n^{-1/2}\widetilde{A}_n} \Rightarrow \nu_{\hat{D}} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}} \,, \quad \text{in probability} \,. \tag{2.8}$$

Proposition 2.3. *The empirical spectral measures of A_n, A_n' and $\widetilde{A}_n$, the respective single-adjacency matrices of G_n, H_n and $\widetilde{H}_n$, satisfy*

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathcal{L}^{\omega_n^{-1/2}A_n}, \mathcal{L}^{\omega_n^{-1/2}A_n'}\right) = o(1) \quad \textit{and} \quad d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathcal{L}^{\omega_n^{-1/2}A_n'}, \mathcal{L}^{\omega_n^{-1/2}\widetilde{A}_n}\right) = o(1) \,,$$

in probability, as $n \to \infty$.

Proof. Setting

$$G_n^{(0)} = G_n \,, \quad G_n^{(2)} = H_n \,, \quad G_n^{(4)} = \widetilde{H}_n \,,$$

associate with each multigraph its sub-degrees (accounting for edge multiplicities),

$$D_{i,b}^{(n,k)} := \sum_{j \in V_n^b} (A_{G_n^{(k)}})_{i,j} \,, \qquad i \in V_n \,, \qquad 1 \le b \le \ell \,,$$

so in particular $D_{i,b}^{(n,2)} = D_{a(i),b}^{(n)}$ where $a(i)$ is such that $i \in V_n^a$. Of course, for $k = 0, 2, 4$,

$$m_{a,b}^{(n,k)} := \sum_{i \in V_n^a} D_{i,b}^{(n,k)} = m_{b,a}^{(n,k)} \,, \quad m_{a,a}^{(n,k)} \text{ is even}, \qquad 1 \le a, b \le \ell \,. \tag{2.9}$$

Claim 2.4. *Conditional on a given sequence of sub-degrees $\{D_{i,b}^{(n,k)}\}$, the adjacency matrices $A_{G_n^{(k)}}$ for $k \in \{0, 2, 4\}$ all have the same conditional law.*

Proof. Observe that $G_n = G_n^{(0)}$ gives the same weight to each perfect matching of its half-edges, thus conditioning on $\{D_{i,b}^{(n,k)}\}$ amounts to specifying a subset of permissible matchings, on which the conditional distribution would be uniform. The same applies to the graphs $H_{(a,b)}^{(n)}$ for all $1 \le a \le b \le \ell$, each being an independently drawn uniform multigraph, and hence to their union $H_n = G_n^{(2)}$, thus establishing the claim for $k = 0, 2$. To treat $k = 4$, notice that the probability that the multigraph $H_{(a,b)}^{(n)}$, $a \ne b$, given the

sub-degrees $\{D_{i,b}^{(n,k)}\}$, features the adjacency matrix $(a_{i,j})$ $(i \in V_n^a,\, j \in V_n^b)$, is

$$\frac{1}{m_{a,b}^{(n,k)}!}\Big(\prod_{i\in V_n^a}\frac{D_{i,b}^{(n,k)}!}{\prod_{j\in V_n^b} a_{i,j}!}\Big)\Big(\prod_{j\in V_n^b} D_{j,a}^{(n,k)}!\Big) \propto \prod_{i\in V_n^a}\prod_{j\in V_n^b}\frac{1}{a_{i,j}!}$$

by the definition of the configuration model. As the distribution of a vector of t i.i.d. Poisson variables with mean λ, conditional on their sum being m, is multinomial with parameters $(m, \frac{1}{t}, \ldots, \frac{1}{t})$, the analogous conditional probability under $\widetilde{H}_{(a,b)}^{(n)}$ is

$$\prod_{i\in V_n^a}\frac{D_{i,b}^{(n,k)}!}{\prod_{j\in V_n^b} a_{i,j}!}|V_n^b|^{-D_{i,b}^{(n,k)}} \propto \prod_{i\in V_a^n}\prod_{j\in V_n^b}\frac{1}{a_{i,j}!}\,.$$

Lastly, the probability that $H_{(a,a)}^{(n)}$, conditional on $\{D_{i,b}^{(n,k)}\}$, assigns to $(a_{i,j})$ is

$$\prod_{i\in V_n^a}\frac{D_i!}{2^{a_{i,i}}}\prod_{\substack{j\in V_n^a\\ j>i}}\frac{1}{a_{i,j}!} \propto 2^{-\sum_i a_{i,i}}\prod_{\substack{i,j\in V_n^a\\ j>i}}\frac{1}{a_{i,j}!}\,,$$

whereas the analogous conditional probability under $\widetilde{H}_{(a,b)}^{(n)}$ (now involving a vector that is multinomial with parameters $(D_{i,b}^{(n,k)}, \frac{1}{2t+1}, \frac{2}{2t+1}, \ldots, \frac{2}{2t+1})$ for $t = |\{j \in V_n^a : j \geq i\}|$, recalling the factor of 2 in the definition of the rate of loops under $\widetilde{H}_{(a,a)}^{(n)}$), is

$$\prod_{i\in V_n^a}\frac{D_{i,b}^{(n,k)}!}{\prod_{\substack{j\in V_n^a\\ j>i}} a_{i,j}!}2^{-a_{i,i}}\Big(\frac{2}{|\{j\in V_n^a : j\geq i\}|}\Big)^{-D_{i,b}^{(n,k)}} \propto 2^{-\sum_i a_{i,i}}\prod_{\substack{i,j\in V_n^a\\ j>i}}\frac{1}{a_{i,j}!}\,.$$

This completes the proof of the claim. ∎

We will introduce two auxiliary multigraphs $G_n^{(1)}$ and $G_n^{(3)}$ having the latter property, and further, the corresponding single-adjacency matrices (or single-edge sets $E_n^{(k)}$), can be coupled in such a way that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{4}\mathbb{E}\Big[\,\Big|E_n^{(k)} \triangle E_n^{(k-1)}\Big|\,\Big] = o(n\omega_n)\,. \tag{2.10}$$

It follows that, under the resulting coupling, both $\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}\,\big((A_n - A_n')^2\big)] = o(n\omega_n)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}\,\big((A_n' - \widetilde{A}_n)^2\big)] = o(n\omega_n)$, yielding Proposition 2.3 via the Hoffman–Wielandt bound.

Proceeding to construct the multigraph $G_n^{(1)}$, write, for all $i \in V_n$ and $1 \leq b \leq \ell$,

$$D_{i,b}^{(n,1)} = D_{i,b}^{(n,0)} \wedge D_{i,b}^{(n,2)}\,, \tag{2.11}$$

then further uniformly reduce the number of potential half-edges in $G_n^{(1)}$ until achieving (2.9) for $k = 1$. That is, if (2.11) yields $m_{a,b}^{(n,1)} > m_{b,a}^{(n,1)}$ for some $a \neq b$, we uniformly choose and eliminate $m_{a,b}^{(n,1)} - m_{b,a}^{(n,1)}$ potential half-edges leading from V_n^a to V_n^b and

accordingly adjust $\{D_{i,b}^{(n,1)}, i \in V_n^a\}$, an operation which only affects the constraint (2.9) for that particular $a \neq b$. With Observation 2.2 in mind, construct two *bridge* copies of the random multigraph $G_n^{(1)}$ with the adjusted sub-degrees $\{D_{i,b}^{(n,1)}\}$, as follows:

- For each i and b, mark as BLUE(b) a uniformly chosen subset of $D_{i,b}^{(n,1)}$ half-edges incident to vertex i, the other part of which is, according to $G_n^{(0)}$, in V_n^b.
- Retain for $G_n^{(1)}$ every edge of $G_n^{(0)}$ where both parts are marked with BLUE.
- After removing all non-BLUE half-edges of $G_n^{(0)}$, complete the construction of $G_n^{(1)}$ by uniformly matching, for each $a \geq b$, all unmatched BLUE(b) half-edges of V_n^a to all unmatched BLUE(a) half-edges of V_n^b.
- A second copy of $G_n^{(1)}$ is obtained by repeating the preceding construction, now with $G_n^{(2)}$ taking the role of $G_n^{(0)}$.

Replacing in the above procedure the multigraph $G_n^{(0)}$ by the multigraph $G_n^{(4)}$, the same construction produces a multigraph $G_n^{(3)}$ having sub-degrees

$$D_{i,b}^{(n,3)} \leq D_{i,b}^{(n,2)} \wedge D_{i,b}^{(n,4)}\,, \tag{2.12}$$

and two *bridge* copies of $G_n^{(3)}$ which are coupled (using such BLUE marking), to $G_n^{(2)}$ and $G_n^{(4)}$, respectively.

Next, as for (2.10), recall that $|E_n^{(k)} \triangle E_n^{(k-1)}| \leq |E_{G_n^{(k)}} \triangle E_{G_n^{(k-1)}}|$, which under our coupling is at most the number of edges of $G_n^{(2[k/2])}$ that had at least one non-BLUE part. This in turn is at most

$$\Delta^{(n)} := \sum_{a,b=1}^{\ell} |m_{a,b}^{(n,k)} - m_{a,b}^{(n,k-1)}|\,.$$

Our construction is such that $m_{a,b}^{(n,0)} \wedge m_{a,b}^{(n,2)} \geq m_{a,b}^{(n,1)}$ and $m_{a,b}^{(n,4)} \wedge m_{a,b}^{(n,2)} \geq m_{a,b}^{(n,3)}$. Further, if the sub-degrees of bridge multigraphs were set by (2.11), then

$$m_{a,b}^{(n,0)} + m_{a,b}^{(n,2)} - 2m_{a,b}^{(n,1)} = \sum_{i \in V_n^a} |D_{i,b}^{(n,0)} - D_{a,b}^{(n)}| := \Delta_{a,b}^{(n,1)}\,,$$

for any $1 \leq a, b \leq \ell$, with analogous identities relating $m_{a,b}^{(n,3)}$ and $\Delta_{a,b}^{(n,3)}$. Since (2.9) holds for $k = 0, 2, 4$, while $m_{a,b}^{(n,1)} \wedge m_{b,a}^{(n,1)}$, $b < a$ are not changed by the $G_n^{(1)}$ sub-degree adjustments (and similarly for the $G_n^{(3)}$ sub-degree adjustments), we deduce that

$$\Delta^{(n)} \leq 2 \sum_{a,b=1}^{\ell} \Delta_{a,b}^{(n,1)} + 2 \sum_{a,b=1}^{\ell} \Delta_{a,b}^{(n,3)}\,.$$

Thus, we have (2.10) as soon as we show that for any $1 \leq a, b \leq \ell$,

$$\mathbb{E}\Delta_{a,b}^{(n,1)} + \mathbb{E}\Delta_{a,b}^{(n,3)} = o(n\omega_n)\,,$$

which by our choice of $\{D^{(n)}_{a,b}\}$ follows from having for any fixed $i \in V^a_n$,

$$\mathbb{E}|\omega_n^{-1} D^{(n,0)}_{i,b} - q_{a,b}| + \mathbb{E}|\omega_n^{-1} D^{(n,4)}_{i,b} - q_{a,b}| = o(1)\,. \tag{2.13}$$

For $i \in V^a_n$ the variable $D^{(n,4)}_{i,b}$ is Poisson with mean $(1+o(1))\lambda^{(n)}_{a,b} m^{(n)}_b = \omega_n q_{a,b}(1+o(1))$ (see (2.7)), hence $\mathbb{E}|\omega_n^{-1} D^{(n,4)}_{i,b} - q_{a,b}| \to 0$. Similarly, $D^{(n,0)}_{i,b}$ counts how many of the $d_a\omega_n$ half-edges emanating from such i, are paired by the uniform matching of the half-edges of G_n, with half-edges from the subset E^b_n of those incident to V^b_n. With $|E^b_n| = d_b\omega_n m^{(n)}_b$, the probability of a specific half-edge paired with an element of E^b_n is $\mu_n = (|E^b_n| - 1_{\{a=b\}})/(2|E_{G_n}| - 1) \to d_b\nu_b$, hence $\omega_n^{-1}\mathbb{E}D^{(n,0)}_{i,b} = d_a\mu_n \to q_{a,b}$. It is not hard to verify that two specific half-edges incident to $i \in V^a_n$ are both paired with elements of E^b_n with probability $v_n = \mu_n^2(1+o(1))$. Consequently,

$$\mathrm{Var}(\omega_n^{-1} D^{(n,0)}_{i,b}) \le d_a \frac{\mu_n}{\omega_n} + d_a^2(v_n - \mu_n^2) \to 0\,,$$

yielding the L^2-convergence of $\omega_n^{-1} D^{(n,0)}_{i,b}$ to $q_{a,b}$ and thereby establishing (2.13). ■

Step III. We proceed to verify (2.8) for the single-adjacency matrices $\widetilde{A}_n$ of $\widetilde{H}_n$. To this end, as argued before, such weak convergence as in (2.8) is not affected by changing $o(n\omega_n)$ of the entries of $\widetilde{A}_n$, so WLOG we modify the law of number of loops in $\widetilde{H}_n$ incident to each $i \in V^a_n$ to be a $\mathrm{Po}(\lambda^{(n)}_{a,a})$ variable, yielding the symmetric matrix $\widetilde{A}_n$ of independent upper triangular Bernoulli$(p^{(n)}_{a,b})$ entries, where $p^{(n)}_{a,b} = 1 - \exp(-\lambda^{(n)}_{a,b})$ when $i \in V^a_n$ and $j \in V^b_n$. In particular, the rank of $\mathbb{E}\widetilde{A}_n$ is at most ℓ, so by Lidskii's theorem we get (2.8) upon proving that $\mathcal{L}^{\hat{B}_n} \Rightarrow \nu_{\hat{D}} \boxtimes \sigma_{\mathrm{SC}}$ in probability, for $\hat{B}_n := \omega_n^{-1/2}(\widetilde{A}_n - \mathbb{E}\widetilde{A}_n)$, a symmetric matrix of uniformly (in n) bounded, independent upper-triangular entries $\{\hat{Z}_{ij}\}$, having zero mean and variance $v^{(n)}_{a,b} := \omega_n^{-1} p^{(n)}_{a,b}(1-p^{(n)}_{a,b}) = \frac{1}{n} d_a d_b(1+o(1))$ when $i \in V^a_n$, $j \in V^b_n$. Recall Remark 1.3 that by [1, Cor. 5.4.11] such convergence holds for the symmetric matrices B_n, whose independent centered Gaussian entries Z_{ij} have variance $v^{(n)}_{a,b}$ when $i \in V^a_n$ and $j \in V^b_n$, subject to on-diagonal rescaling $\mathbb{E}Z^2_{ii} = 2v^{(n)}_{a(i),a(i)}$. As in the classical proof of Wigner's theorem by the moment's method (cf. [1, Sec. 2.1.3]), it is easy to check that for any fixed $k = 1, 2, \ldots,$

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{tr}(\hat{B}^k_n)\Big] = \mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{tr}(B^k_n)\Big](1+o(1))\,,$$

since both expressions are dominated by those cycles of length k that pass via each entry of the relevant matrix exactly twice (or not at all). Further, adapting the argument of [1, Sec. 2.1.4] we deduce that as in the Wigner's case, $\langle x^k, \mathcal{L}^{\hat{B}_n} - \mathcal{L}^{\mathbb{E}\hat{B}_n}\rangle \to 0$ in probability, for each fixed k, thereby completing the proof of Theorem 1.1 ■

Proof of Corollary 1.4. The assumed growth of ω_n yields (1.1) out of (1.2). The latter amounts to $\frac{1}{n}\sum_i \hat{D}^{(n)}_i \to 1$ in probability, which we get by applying the L^2-WLLN for triangular arrays with uniformly bounded second moments. The same reasoning

yields the required uniform integrability in (1.3), namely $\frac{1}{n}\sum_i \hat{D}_i^{(n)} 1_{\{\hat{D}_i^{(n)} \geq r\}} \to 0$ in probability (when $n \to \infty$ followed by $r \to \infty$). Further, applying the weak law for non-negative triangular arrays $\{\hat{D}_i^{(n)})^2\}$ of uniformly bounded mean, at the truncation level $b_n := n/\sqrt{\omega_n/n} \gg n$, it is not hard to deduce that $b_n^{-1}\sum_i (\hat{D}_i^{(n)})^2 \to 0$ in probability, namely that the RHS of (1.3) also holds. Recall that the empirical measures $\mathcal{L}^{\hat{\Lambda}_n}$ of i.i.d. $\hat{D}_i^{(n)}$ converge in probability to the weak limit $\nu_{\hat{D}}$ of the laws of $\hat{D}_1^{(n)}$ and apply Theorem 1.1 for G_n of degrees $[\omega_n \hat{D}_i^{(n)}]$ to get Corollary 1.4. ■

3. Analysis of the limiting density

Proof of Proposition 1.5. The matrix $M_n := n^{-1}\widetilde{X}_n \Lambda_n^2 \widetilde{X}_n^\star$ has the same ESD as $n^{-1}\Lambda_n \widetilde{X}_n \widetilde{X}_n^\star \Lambda_n$. Thus, μ_{MP} is also the limiting ESD for M_n (see [6,8]). Taking $\mathcal{L}^{\Lambda_n} \Rightarrow \nu$ with $d\nu/d\nu_{\hat{D}}(x) = x$ yields the Cauchy–Stieltjes transform $G_{\mu_{\text{MP}}}(z) = h(z)$ which is the unique decaying to zero as $|z| \to \infty$, $\mathbb{C}_+$-valued analytic on $\mathbb{C}_+$, solution of

$$h = \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\hat{D}^2}{1+h\hat{D}}\right] - z\right)^{-1} = -z^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\hat{D}}{1+h\hat{D}}\right]. \tag{3.1}$$

Indeed, the LHS of (3.1) merely re-writes the fact that $\xi(\cdot)$ of (1.7) is such that $\xi(h(z)) = z$ on $\mathbb{C}_+$, while having $\int x d\nu_{\hat{D}} = 1$, one thereby gets the RHS of (3.1) by elementary algebra. Recall [2, Prop. 5(a)] that the Cauchy–Stieltjes transform of the symmetric measure $\widetilde{\mu}$ having the push-forward $\widetilde{\mu}^{(2)} = \mu_{\text{MP}}$ under the map $x \mapsto x^2$, is given for $\Re(z) > 0$ by $g(z) = zh(z^2) : \mathbb{C}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{C}_+$, which by the RHS of (3.1) satisfies for $\Re(z) > 0$,

$$g = -\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\hat{D}}{z + g\hat{D}}\right]. \tag{3.2}$$

By the symmetry of the measure $\widetilde{\mu}$ on $\mathbb{R}$ we know that $g(-\bar{z}) = -\bar{g}(z)$ thereby extending the validity of (3.2) to all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Applying the implicit function theorem in a suitable neighborhood of $(-z^{-1}, g) = (0,0)$ we further deduce that $g(z) = G_{\widetilde{\mu}}(z)$ is the unique $\mathbb{C}_+$-valued, analytic on $\mathbb{C}_+$ solution of (3.2) tending to zero as $\Im(z) \to \infty$. Recall the S-transform $S_q(w) := (1 + w^{-1})m_q^{-1}(w)$ of probability measure $q \neq \delta_0$ on $\mathbb{R}_+$, where

$$m_q(z) = \int \frac{zt}{1 - zt} dq(t)\,, \tag{3.3}$$

is invertible (as a formal power series in $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$), see [2, Prop. 1]. The S-transform is similarly defined for symmetric probability measures, see [2, Thm. 6], yielding in particular $S_{\sigma_{\text{SC}}}(w) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{w}}$ (see [2, Eqn. (20)]). From (3.3) we see that (3.2) results with $m_{\nu_{\hat{D}}}(-z^{-1}g) = g^2$, consequently having $S_{\nu_{\hat{D}}}(g^2) = -(1 + g^{-2})z^{-1}g$. Recall [2, Thm. 7] that $S_{q \boxtimes q'}(w) = S_q(w)S_{q'}(w)$ provided $q' \neq \delta_0$ is symmetric, while $q(\mathbb{R}_+) = 1$ and q has non-zero mean. Considering $q = \nu_{\hat{D}}$ and $q' = \sigma_{\text{SC}}$ it thus follows that $S_\mu(g^2) = -(1 + g^{-2})z^{-1}$ and consequently $m_\mu(-z^{-1}) = g^2$. The latter amounts to

$$f(z) := -z^{-1}(1 + g^2) = \int \frac{1}{-t - z} d\mu(t)\,, \tag{3.4}$$

which since μ is symmetric, matches the stated relation $f(z) = G_\mu(z)$ of (1.4). ∎

Proof of Proposition 1.7. Recall from (3.4) that $f(z) = -zh(z^2)^2 - z^{-1}$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$ and $\Re(z) > 0$. When $z \to x \in (0,\infty)$ we further have that $h(z^2) \to h(x^2)$ and hence

$$\frac{1}{\pi}\Im(f(z)) \to -\frac{1}{\pi}\Im(xh(x^2)^2) = -2\Re(h(x^2))\widetilde{\rho}(x)\,, \tag{3.5}$$

where the last identity is due to (1.5). Thus, for a.e. $x > 0$ the density $\rho(x)$ exists and given by Plemelj formula, namely the RHS of (3.5). The continuity of $x \mapsto h(x)$ implies the same for the symmetric density $\rho(x)$, thereby we deduce the validity of (1.6) at *every* $x \neq 0$. While proving [9, Thm. 1.1] it was shown that $h(z)$ extends analytically around each $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ where $\Im(h(x)) > 0$ (see also Remark 1.8). In particular, (1.6) implies that $\rho(x)$ is real analytic at any $x \neq 0$ where it is positive. Further, in view of (1.6), the support identity $S_\mu = S_{\widetilde{\mu}}$ is an immediate consequence of having $\Re(h(x)) < 0$ for all $x > 0$ (as shown in Lemma 3.1). Similarly, the stated relation with $S_{\mu_{\text{MP}}}$ follows from the explicit relation $\widetilde{\rho}(x) = |x|\rho_{\text{MP}}(x^2)$. Finally, Lemma 3.1 provides the stated bounds on $\widetilde{\rho}$ and ρ (see (3.6) and (3.7), respectively), while showing that if $\nu_{\hat{D}}(\{0\}) = 0$ then μ is absolutely continuous. ∎

Our next lemma provides the estimates we deferred when proving Proposition 1.7.

Lemma 3.1. *The function $g(z) = G_{\widetilde{\mu}}(z)$ satisfies*

$$|g(z)| \leq 1 \wedge \frac{2}{|\Re(z)|}\,, \qquad \forall z \in \mathbb{C}_+ \cup \mathbb{R} \tag{3.6}$$

and (3.2) *holds for $z \in \mathbb{C}_+ \cup \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, resulting with $\Re(h(x)) < 0$ for $x > 0$. In addition*

$$\rho(x) \leq \frac{1}{\pi}\big(\mathbb{E}\hat{D}^{-2}\big)^{1/2} \wedge 4|x|^{-3}\big) \qquad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}\,, \tag{3.7}$$

and if $\nu_{\hat{D}}(\{0\}) = 0$, then $\mu(\{0\}) = 0$.

Proof. As explained when proving Proposition 1.5, by the symmetry of $\widetilde{\mu}$, we only need to consider $\Re(z) \geq 0$. Starting with $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, let

$$\begin{aligned} z &= x + i\eta \qquad \text{for } x \geq 0 \text{ and } \eta > 0\,,\\ g(z) &= -y + i\gamma \qquad \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \gamma > 0\,. \end{aligned}$$

Then, separating the real and imaginary parts of (3.2) gives

$$y = \mathbb{E}\left[\hat{D}(x - y\hat{D})\hat{W}^{-2}\right]\,, \quad \gamma = \mathbb{E}\left[\hat{D}(\eta + \gamma\hat{D})\hat{W}^{-2}\right]\,, \tag{3.8}$$

where $\hat{W} := |z + g(z)\hat{D}|$ must be a.s. strictly positive (or else $\gamma = \infty$). Next, defining

$$A = A(z) := \mathbb{E}[\hat{D}\hat{W}^{-2}]\,, \qquad B = B(z) := \mathbb{E}[\hat{D}^2\hat{W}^{-2}]\,, \tag{3.9}$$

both of which are positive and finite (or else $\gamma = \infty$), translates (3.8) into

$$y = Ax - By\,, \qquad \gamma = A\eta + B\gamma\,.$$

Therefore,

$$y = \frac{Ax}{1+B}\,, \qquad \gamma = \frac{A\eta}{1-B}\,. \tag{3.10}$$

Since $\gamma > 0$, necessarily $0 < B < 1$ and $y \geq 0$ is strictly positive iff $x > 0$. Next, by (3.2), Jensen's inequality and (3.9),

$$|g| \leq \mathbb{E}\Big[\hat{D}\hat{W}^{-1}\Big] := V(z) \leq \sqrt{B} \leq 1\,. \tag{3.11}$$

Further, letting $D \sim \nu$ be the size-biasing of $\hat{D}$ and $W := |z + g(z)D|$, we have that

$$g(z) = -\mathbb{E}[(z+g(z)D)^{-1}]\,, \quad V = \mathbb{E}[W^{-1}]\,, \quad A = \mathbb{E}[W^{-2}]\,. \tag{3.12}$$

With $B < 1$ we thus have by (3.10), (3.12) and Jensen's inequality, that

$$\frac{|x|A}{2} \leq \frac{|x|A}{1+B} = |y| \leq |g| \leq V \leq \sqrt{A}\,.$$

Consequently, $|g(z)| \leq \sqrt{A} \leq 2/|x|$ as claimed. Next, recall [9, Theorem 1.1] that $h(z) \to h(x)$ whenever $z \to x \neq 0$, hence same applies to $g(\cdot)$ with (3.6) and the bound $B(z) \leq 1$, also applicable throughout $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Further, having $z_n \to x \neq 0$ implies that $|\Re(z_n)|$ is bounded away from zero, hence $\{A(z_n)\}$ are uniformly bounded. In view of (3.12), this yields the uniform integrability of $(z_n + g(z_n)D)^{-1}$ and thereby its L_1-convergence to the absolutely-integrable $(x+g(x)D)^{-1}$. Appealing to the representation (3.12) of $g(z)$ we conclude that (3.2) extends to $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Utilizing (3.2) at $z = x > 0$ we see that $0 < |g(x)|^2 \leq A(x)$ due to (3.12). Hence, from (3.8) we have as claimed,

$$\Re(h(x^2)) = x^{-1}\Re(g(x)) = \frac{-A(x)}{1+B(x)} < 0\,.$$

From (3.10) we have that $g(z) = i\gamma$ when $z = i\eta$, where by (3.2), for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\gamma = \mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{\hat{D}}{\eta + \gamma\hat{D}}\Big] \geq \frac{\delta}{\eta + \gamma\delta}\nu_{\hat{D}}([\delta,\infty))\,.$$

Taking $\eta \downarrow 0$ followed by $\delta \downarrow 0$ we see that $\gamma(i\eta) \to \gamma(0) = 1$, provided $\nu_{\hat{D}}(\{0\}) = 0$. By definition of the Cauchy–Stieljes transform and bounded convergence, we have then

$$\mu(\{0\}) = -\lim_{\eta\downarrow 0}\Re(i\eta f(i\eta)) = 1 - [\lim_{\eta\downarrow 0}\gamma(i\eta)]^2 = 0\,,$$

due to (3.4) (and having $\Re(g(i\eta)) = 0$). Finally, from (3.2) and the LHS of (3.4) we have that $f(z) = -\mathbb{E}[(z+g(z)\hat{D})^{-1}]$ throughout $\mathbb{C}_+$, hence by Cauchy-Shwarz

$$|f(z)| \leq \mathbb{E}[\hat{W}^{-1}] \leq \sqrt{B(z)\mathbb{E}[\hat{D}^{-2}]} \leq \mathbb{E}[\hat{D}^{-2}]^{1/2}$$

is uniformly bounded when $\mathbb{E}\hat{D}^{-2}$ is finite. Up to factor π^{-1} this yields the stated uniform bound on $\rho(x)$, namely the RHS of (3.5). At any $x > 0$ the latter is bounded above also by $\frac{1}{\pi x}|g(x)|^2$, with (3.7) thus a consequence of (3.6). ■

Proof of Corollary 1.9. Fixing $\alpha > \beta > 0$ we have that

$$\nu_{\hat{D}}(\{\alpha\}) = q_o\,, \quad \nu_{\hat{D}}(\{\beta\}) = 1 - q_o$$

and since $1 = \mathbb{E}\hat{D} = \alpha q_o + \beta(1-q_o)$, further $\alpha > 1 > \beta$. By Remark 1.8 we identify S_μ upon examining the regions in which $\xi'(-v) > 0$ for $\mathbb{R}$-valued $v \notin \{0, \alpha^{-1}, \beta^{-1}\}$. Since $\Re(h(x)) < 0$ for $x > 0$ (see Lemma 3.1), for $S_\mu \cap \mathbb{R}_+$ it suffices to consider the sign of

$$\xi'(-v) = \frac{1}{v^2} - \frac{q\alpha^2}{(1-v\alpha)^2} - \frac{(1-q)\beta^2}{(1-v\beta)^2}\,,$$

when $v \in (0,\infty) \setminus \{\alpha^{-1}, \beta^{-1}\}$ and $q := \alpha q_o$. Observe that $\xi'(-v) > 0$ for such v iff

$$\begin{aligned} P(v) &:= av^3 + bv^2 + cv + d \\ &= -2\alpha\beta(q\beta + (1-q)\alpha)v^3 + \left(q\beta^2 + 4\alpha\beta + (1-q)\alpha^2\right)v^2 - 2(\alpha+\beta)v + 1 > 0\,. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\lim_{v\to\infty} P(v) = -\infty$ and $\lim_{v\downarrow 0} P(v) = 1$, we infer from Remark 1.8 that S_μ has holes iff $P(v)$ has three distinct positive roots. As Descrate's rule of signs is satisfied ($a, c < 0$ and $b, d > 0$), the latter occurs iff the discriminant $D(P)$ is positive. Evaluating $D(P)$ shows that

$$D(P) = b^2c^2 - 4ac^3 - 4b^3d + 18abcd - 27a^2d^2 = 4q(1-q)(\alpha-\beta)^2\left(\alpha B - qA\right),$$

where

$$A = (\alpha-\beta)(\alpha+\beta)^3\,, \qquad B = (\alpha - 2\beta)^3\,.$$

Having $q = \alpha q_o$ and $A > 0$ we conclude that $D(P) > 0$ iff $B/A > q_o$. That is

$$\frac{B}{A} = \frac{(\alpha-2\beta)^3}{(\alpha-\beta)(\alpha+\beta)^3} > \frac{1-\beta}{\alpha-\beta} = q_0\,.$$

For $\varphi = 3\beta/(\alpha+\beta)$ and $\beta \in (0,1)$ this translates into $1-\varphi > (1-\beta)^{1/3}$, or equivalently

$$\frac{\alpha}{\beta} + 1 = \frac{3}{\varphi} > \frac{3}{1-(1-\beta)^{1/3}}\,,$$

as stated in (1.8). ∎

Acknowledgment. The authors wish to thank Alice Guionnet and Ofer Zeitouni for many helpful discussions. A.D. was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1613091. E.L. was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1513403.

References

[1] G. W. Anderson, A. Guionnet, and O. Zeitouni. *An introduction to random matrices*, volume 118 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.

[2] O. Arizmendi E. and V. Pérez-Abreu. The S-transform of symmetric probability measures with unbounded supports. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 137(9):3057–3066, 2009.

[3] H. Bercovici and D. Voiculescu. Free convolution of measures with unbounded support. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 42(3):733–773, 1993.

[4] C. Bordenave and M. Lelarge. Resolvent of large random graphs. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 37(3):332–352, 2010.

[5] W. Hachem, A. Hardy, and J. Najim. Large complex correlated Wishart matrices: fluctuations and asymptotic independence at the edges. *Ann. Probab.*, 44(3):2264–2348, 2016.
[6] V. A. Marčenko and L. A. Pastur. Distribution of eigenvalues for some sets of random matrices. *Mathematics of the USSR-Sbornik*, 1(4):457–483, 1967.
[7] N. R. Rao and R. Speicher. Multiplication of free random variables and the S-transform: the case of vanishing mean. *Electron. Comm. Probab.*, 12:248–258, 2007.
[8] J. W. Silverstein and Z. D. Bai. On the empirical distribution of eigenvalues of a class of large-dimensional random matrices. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 54(2):175–192, 1995.
[9] J. W. Silverstein and S.-I. Choi. Analysis of the limiting spectral distribution of large-dimensional random matrices. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 54(2):295–309, 1995.
[10] D. Voiculescu. Multiplication of certain noncommuting random variables. *J. Operator Theory*, 18(2):223–235, 1987.

Amir Dembo
Department of Mathematics, Stanford University, Sloan Hall, Stanford, CA 94305, USA.
E-mail address: amir@math.stanford.edu

Eyal Lubetzky
Courant Institute, New York University, 251 Mercer Street, New York, NY 10012, USA.
E-mail address: eyal@courant.nyu.edu